

Appl. No. 10/735,161
Amdt. dated Feb. 15, 2005
Reply to Office action of Nov. 15, 2004

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated November 15, 2004, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendment and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 24 and 27 have been amended and new claims 31-41 have been added, leaving claims 1-41 for consideration upon entry of the present amendment. The Examiner's indication that claims 8-10, 14-19, 22, 23, 25, 26, 29 and 30 contain allowable subject matter is gratefully acknowledged. The amendment is fully supported by the disclosure. No new matter has been added by the amendment.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-3, 7, 12 and 13

Claims 1-3, 7, 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Radons et al., U.S. Patent No 5,605,150 (hereinafter "Radons").

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). It is submitted that Radons fails to teach each and every element as set forth in the claim 1 for at least the reasons described below.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite, *inter alia*, a guide step formed on the side face to be inserted into the guide groove, and a warpage preventing protrusion formed on the guide step to provide a recess portion at a selected region of the guide step.

In the rejection of claim 1, the Examiner has indicated that element 104a of Figure 3 of Radons corresponds to the guide step of the claimed invention, and that element 103a of Figure 3 corresponds to the warpage prevention protrusion of the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's analysis.

Element 104a of Figure 3 in Radons discloses a stiffening portion that is not inserted into a channel (130) of a socket (60) (see col. 6, lines 34-37). In contrast, the guide step of the claimed invention is formed to be inserted into the guide groove. Thus, it is respectfully

Appl. No. 10/735,161
Amdt. dated Feb. 15, 2005
Reply to Office action of Nov. 15, 2004

submitted that element 104a in Radons is not analogous to the guide step of the claimed invention.

Even if assuming that element 103a of Radons, which is inserted into the channel (130) of the socket (60), is analogous to the guide step of the claimed invention, Radons still fails to teach the guide step and the warpage preventing protrusion as claimed in claim 1. Unlike the claimed invention, element 103a of Radons does not have a warpage preventing protrusion formed thereon. Further, there is no teaching in Radons of anything about the warpage preventing protrusion providing a recess portion on the guide step, as claimed in claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be patentably distinct and nonobvious in view of Radons. Claims 2, 3, 7, 12 and 13 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, and thus include all the limitations of claim 1. The dependent claims are thus believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 1.

Claims 1-3, 7, 12, 13, 20 and 21

Claims 1-3, 7, 12, 13, 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Yong et al., U.S. Patent No 5,980,273 (hereinafter "Yong").

As stated above Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite, *inter alia*, a warpage preventing protrusion formed on the guide step to provide a recess portion at a selected region of the guide step to prevent the connection pins from being bent at the time of detaching the first connection part from the second connection part.

In contrast, Yong discloses a projection (122) having a wedge protrusion (no reference numeral) inserted into an opening (121a) (see Figure 8, and col. 7, lines 57-60). In Yong, however, the wedge protrusion provides no recess portion to prevent connection pins from being bent. Thus, Yong fails to teach a warpage preventing protrusion formed on the guide step to provide a recess portion at a selected region of the guide step, as claimed in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be patentably distinct and nonobvious in view of Yong. Claims 2, 3, 7, 12, 13, 20 and 21 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, thus include all the limitations of claim 1. Thus, claims 2, 3, 7, 12, 13, 20 and 21 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 1, which is believed to be allowable.

Appl. No. 10/735,161
Amdt dated Feb. 15, 2005
Reply to Office action of Nov. 15, 2004

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections of claims 1-3, 7, 12, 13, 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claim 24

Claim 24 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Yong.

Applicant has amended claim 24 to recite, *inter alia*, the guide step having a front surface adjacent to the front face of the second connection part, the front surface and the front face being coplanar.

As stated above, Yong discloses a projection (122) having a wedge protrusion (no reference numeral) inserted into an opening (121a) (see Figure 8, and col. 7, lines 57-60). The projection (122) of Yong has a front surface that forms a portion of the wedge protrusion, however, no portion of the wedge protrusion is coplanar with the front face of the receptacle (112). Thus, Yong fails to teach or disclose the guide step having a front surface adjacent to the front face of the second connection part, the front surface and the front face being coplanar as recited in amended claim 24.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In order for an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art; that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references; and that the proposed modification of the prior art must have had a reasonable expectation of success, determined from the vantage point of the skilled artisan at the time the invention was made. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Amgen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996). See MPEP 2143.

Appl. No. 10/735,161
Amtd. dated Feb. 15, 2005
Reply to Office action of Nov. 15, 2004

Claims 4-6 and 13

Claims 4-6 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Radons in view of Bixler et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,466,171 (hereinafter "Bixler").

As mentioned above, Radons fails to teach a warpage preventing protrusion formed on the guide step to provide a recess portion at a selected region of the guide step as recited in amended claim 1. Bixler is directed to an electrical connector assembly having polarizing posts that lack a recess portion. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Bixler of a warpage preventing protrusion formed on the guide step to provide a recess portion at a selected region of the guide step. Thus the cited references do not render claim 1 obvious. Claims 4-6 and 13 depend indirectly from claim 1, thus include all the limitations of claim 1. The dependent claims 4-6 and 13 are patentable for at least the same reasons as given above for the independent claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections of claims 4-6 and 13.

Claim 11

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Radons in view of Wandler, U.S. Patent No. 5,486,124 (hereinafter "Wandler").

As mentioned above, Radons fails to teach a warpage preventing protrusion formed on the guide step to provide a recess portion at a selected region of the guide step as recited in amended claim 1. Wandler is directed to a plastic hood for a socket in an electrical connector. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Wandler of a warpage preventing protrusion formed on the guide step to provide a recess portion at a selected region of the guide step. Thus the cited references do not render claim 1 obvious. Claim 11 depends from claim 1, thus includes all the limitations of claim 1. The dependent claim 11 is patentable for at least the same reasons as given above for the independent claim 1.

Thus, for all the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully requests Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 11.

Appl. No. 10/735,161
Amdt. dated Feb. 15, 2005
Reply to Office action of Nov. 15, 2004

Claims 27 and 28

Claims 27 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Furuya et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,193,069 (hereinafter "Furuya") in view of Yong.

Applicant has amended claim 27 to recite, *inter alia*, a warpage preventing protrusion formed on the guide step to provide a recess portion at a selected region of the guide step.

Furuya is directed to an LCD device having a connector (701). The connector (701) of Furuya lacks any structural description in either the drawings or the specification (see Figure 2, and col. 5 line 66, to col. 6 line 24). Thus, Furuya fails to teach a warpage preventing protrusion formed on the guide step to provide a recess portion at a selected region of the guide step as claimed in amended claim 27.

As mentioned above regarding claim 1, Yong also fails to teach the structural features of the connector as claimed. Specifically, Yong fails to teach a warpage preventing protrusion formed on the guide step to provide a recess portion at a selected region of the guide step as recited in amended claim 27.

Since neither cited reference teaches the structural features of the connector as claimed in amended claim 27, the cited references do not render claim 27 obvious. Claim 28 depends directly from claim 27, thus includes all the limitations of claim 27. The dependent claim 28 is patentable for at least the same reasons as given above for the independent claim 27.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claims 27 and 28.

Newly Added Claims

Applicant has added new claims 31-41 to more particularly define aspects of the present invention. The new claims include no new matter and are fully supported by the specification and the drawings of the present application.

Accordingly, it is believed that the new claims are in condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 10/735,161
Amdt. dated Feb. 15, 2005
Reply to Office action of Nov. 15, 2004

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicant's attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: 
Chad L. Thorson
Reg. No. 55,675
Confirmation No. 1648
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Date: February 15, 2005